

REMARKS

In the Office action mailed October 28, 2005, the examiner rejects claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 12, 16, 17, and 20. These claims are pending and under consideration.

I. Response to § 103 rejections

The examiner rejects claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 12, 16, 17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,748,365 ("Quinlan") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,847,935 ("Solomon"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites extracting "a range of values of a second information between a minimum value of the second information to a maximum value of the second information." Additionally, claim 1 recites considering whether purchase information has a value within this range of values when storing purchase information as "invalid" or as "unidentified validity". None of the references cited by the examiner teach or suggest these features.

First, the applicant notes that the Office action does not mention these features. As such, it appears that the examiner failed to consider these features.

Regarding Quinlan, Quinlan describes a system for processing rebate claims and does not teach anything comparable to these features. The admission in the Office action at the top of page 5 appears to support this.

Regarding Solomon, Solomon also fails to describe any features comparable to these features of claim 1. The text of Solomon cited by the examiner discloses storing breakage rates of rebate transactions, storing disbursement options, and storing a current state of a rebate request from a consumer. None of these teachings relate to the "range of values" features of claim 1. Additionally, no other portions of Solomon teach any feature similar to the "range of values" features of claim 1.

As neither Quinlan nor Solomon teach any feature comparable to the "range of values" features of claim 1, the references in combination also do not teach or suggest these features. As such, the prior art cited by the examiner does not render claim 1 unpatentable.

Regarding claims 7, 11, 16, 17, and 20, Quinlan in view of Solomon does not render these claims unpatentable at least because each of these claims includes a feature similar to a feature of claim 1 discussed above. Regarding claims 2-4, 6, 8, 9, and 12, the prior art cited by

the examiner does not render these claims unpatentable at least because each of these claims depends upon an allowable base claim.

II. Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this reply, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2-28-06

By: 
John C. Garvey
Registration No. 28,607

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501